REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2000, the Examiner noted that claims 32-51 were pending and finally rejected all claims. Claims 32, 35-38, 42, and 45-48 have been amended, new claims 52-53 have been added and, thus, in view of the foregoing, claims 32-53 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Claims 32-51 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pape (U.S. Patent No. 4,819,059) in view of Ueda (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,816).

By this amendment, independent claims 32 and 42 have been changed to more clearly set forth the present invention. As amended, claims 32 and 42 particularly point out that the electronic still camera includes an image sensor having a two-dimensional array of photosites covered by a mosaic pattern of color filters for capturing images of a scene, with each captured image having a first number of color pixel values provided in a first color pattern. The electronic camera also includes motion processing means (a motion processor in amended claim 42) for generating from the captured images, a second number of color pixel values provided in a second color pattern and representative of a series of motion images to be previewed. As set forth in amended claims 32 and 42, the second number of color pixel values is less than the first number of color pixel values, and the second color pattern is different from the first color pattern. The electronic camera further includes a color display for presenting at least some of the motion images of the series of motion images corresponding to the captured images of the scene, and having an arrangement of color display pixels in a pattern different from the first color pattern. In addition, the electronic camera includes a capture button for initiating capture of a still image while previewing the motion images presented on the color display; still processing means (a still processor in amended claim 42) for generating a third number of color pixel values representative of a processed captured still image; and a digital memory for storing the processed captured still image.

Pape and Ueda, both singly and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the electronic still camera as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42. In

particular, Pape and Ueda do not disclose or suggest an electronic camera having an image sensor for capturing images having a first number of color pixel values provided in a first color pattern, and motion processing means (motion processor) for generating from the captured images, a second number of color pixel values provided in a second color pattern and representative of a series of motion images to be previewed, with the second number of color pixel values being less than the first number of color pixel values, and the second color pattern being different from the first color pattern. Further, Pape and Ueda do not disclose or suggest a color display for presenting at least some of the motion images of the series of motion images corresponding to the captured images of the scene, with the color display having an arrangement of color display pixels in a pattern different from the first color pattern.

Pape is directed to a system for formatting and deformatting moving image defining electronic information signals interspersed with still image defining electronic information signals. The system of Pape includes decimator circuits 28R, 28G, and 28B, and undecimator circuits 54R, 54G, and 54B. The decimator circuits operate on the still image to divide the high resolution still image into a number of lower resolution images for recording on a standard video formatted recorder as multiple field images. On video playback, these multiple field signals are provided to the undecimator circuits to reformat the signal to recover the original high resolution still image. In contrast, the processing performed by the electronic camera of the present invention operates on the motion images.

Further, the decimator and undecimator circuits of Pape do not modify the color pattern of the image. Rather, the decimator circuits reduce by an equal amount, the number of red, green, and blue pixels from the still image used in each recorded video field to obtain the motion images for recording. Similarly, the undecimator circuits increase by an equal amount, the number of red, green, and blue pixels from the recorded video fields to provide the high resolution still image at playback. Pape's combination of decimation for recording and undecimation for playback results in an unmodified image.

In contrast, the motion processing means (motion processor) as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42 produces a digital image with fewer pixels in a

different color pattern which can then be provided to a color display having a color pattern different form the color pattern used by the image sensor. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in Pape.

In addition, as the Examiner has acknowledged, Pape fails to disclose or suggest that a still image is captured while previewing the motion images. However, the Examiner cites the Ueda reference as providing such teachings.

Although Ueda is directed to a recording apparatus which records a moving image and a still image on the same recording medium, Ueda (and Pape in combination therewith) does not teach or suggest any processing which modifies the color pattern of the color pixel values provided by an image sensor to provide a different color pattern or a different number of color pixel values, as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42. In fact, Ueda does not provide any disclosure or suggestion at all regarding a color image sensor or a color display.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the combined teachings of the Pape and Ueda references fail to teach or suggest the features set forth in amended claims 32 and 42 discussed above. It is submitted that the invention of amended independent claims 32 and 42 distinguishes over Pape and Ueda, and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are believed to be patentable over the prior art for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela R. Crocker

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,447

Pamela R. Crocker/phw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (716) 477-0553
Facsimile: (716) 477-4646